

(3) whether the Town Improvement Committee is still in existence, and if not, when was it abolished?

Diwan Bahadur Dr. V. Verghese.—(1) For works relating to 1099, 1100 and 1101 see appendix III to question No. 154 of the Budget Session of 1101. For those relating to 1102 and 1103 see appendix to question No. 257 of the last Council sitting. These works were proposed and carried out in consultation with the Committee.

(2) They were recommended in the years noted therein. Exact date of each is difficult to trace out.

(3) The Committee is still in existence.

Plantation ranges under the Taungya System.

431. Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Will the Government be pleased to place on the Table:—

(1) copy of the Conservator's letter in 1103 to the Divisional Forest Officer and the Plantation Ranger regarding areas to be given for plantation to Messrs. Chinnava Rowther, C. I. Mathew, Abdul Kadir and others, under the Taungya system in 1104, at Nagathenpara side in Kodasseri Komban;

(2) report of the Southern Divisional Officer on the area selected and copies of further correspondence thereon;

(3) were the areas handed over to the parties as at first ordered and have the contractors taken up the work;

(4) if the areas were not handed over, the reason for not doing so in spite of the original orders of the Conservator of Forests?

Mr. K. Govinda Menon.—(1) and (2). Copies of the correspondence are placed on the Council Table.

(3) No.

(4) It was subsequently considered better to wait till the selection and exclusion of areas in the locality fit for food crop cultivation is over.

Kuri Vaimpus and Security Bonds.

432. Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Will the Government be pleased to state the total number and the total valuation of Kuri Vaimpus and Kuri Security Bonds registered every year during the last 5 years in each of the Registry Offices in the State?

Mr. U. Kandar Menon.—A statement containing the information is appended. (*Vide Appendix VIII.*)

Olarikkara Aided School.

433. Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Will the Government be pleased to place on the Table of the House the report

of the Inspectress of the Schools with regard to the Olariikkara aided school referred to in question No. 45 of the Budget Session of 1103 and the supplementary answers given to the same; and what is the report of the Inspector of Schools with regard to the identity of the two names—David Chiriankandath Kada and C. R. Devassi referred to in the supplementary answers of the same questions?

Rao Sahib Mr. C. Matthai.—The report of the Inspectress of Schools is appended (*vide Appendix IX*).

It is reported that they are cousins.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—What was the report of the Inspector of Schools?

Rao Sahib Mr. C. Matthai.—Was that asked?

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—I want the report itself. There is no appendix. Only the paraphrase is given. The report referred to there is only for the first part of the question.

Rao Sahib Mr. C. Matthai.—The whole report is reproduced here. That is all the report. On that point only the Inspector was asked.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—My information is both the names are identical.

Rao Sahib Mr. C. Matthai.—It is stated there that they are cousins.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—I want the original report in full.

Rao Sahib Mr. C. Matthai.—The Inspector of Schools was the only person asked to report. It contained only one sentence. He said that these two persons, Kada and Devassi, are cousins.

Aided Schools managed by Government Servants.

434. Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Will the Government be pleased to state the names of the aided schools in the State managed by Government servants and the names of such managers?

Rao Sahib Mr. C. Matthai.—Vide statement appended below.

- | | |
|----|----------------------------|
| 1 | P. N. S. Tattamangalam |
| 2 | St. Thomas' S. Palanji |
| 3 | Scouts N. S. Tiruvilvamala |
| 4 | Night School, Kuthampilly |
| 5 | Do. Pampady |
| 6 | S. D. S., Velappai |
| 7 | Night School, Mattathur |
| 8 | Do. Adoor |
| 9 | Do. for Adults, Mala |
| 10 | Do. Puthenpeedika |
| 11 | Do. Manalur |

- | |
|-------------------------|
| P. Vasu Menon. |
| K. I. Ipathu. |
| P. V. Krishna Ayyar. |
| T. A. Naganatha Ayyar. |
| T. N. Viswanatha Ayyar. |
| K. A. Sankaran. |
| M. K. Subramania Sarma. |
| M. Sankara Menon. |
| C. Sankara Menon. |
| V. T. Joseph |
| P. Madhava Menon |

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1115

APPENDIX IX.

(Vide answer to Question No. 433).

Letter dated 25-5-27, C.No. 2699 of 102, from the Inspectress of Schools.

"With reference to your Memo, dated 17th May 1927, P. 1105/1102, I have the honour to report that, as the distance from the Olarikkara Temple to Chettupula Bridge is only 7 furlongs as per the Schedule of Distances, the distance from the Chettupula school to the proposed school will be about 5 furlongs.

In this connection, it may also be kindly noted that the starting of a school at Olarikkara will affect the strength equally of M.G. S. Aranattukara, M. G. S., Ayyanthole and St. Anne's P. G. S., West Fort besides other schools under other Inspecting Officers. The school at Elthuruth has already represented its grievances".

APPENDIX X.

(Vide answer to Question No. 436).

PROCEEDINGS OF THE DIWAN OF COCHIN.

Local and Miscellaneous Department.

(Miscellaneous)

READ Again (1) Diwan's Proceedings Dis. No. 56/R/103, dated 1st October 1927.

Also (2) Letter S. C. No. 434/02, dated 13th October 1927, from the Diwan Peishkar.

(3) Petition dated 4th Vrischigam 1103 from Eacharathu Kesavan Nayar and other Hindu inhabitants of Olarikkara, Ayyanthol, etc., villages of Trichur Taluk forwarded by their Vakil.

(4) Letter dated 12th October 1927 from the Bishop of Trichur.

And (5) Correspondence ending with the Sarvadhikariakar's communication A. No. 287/1104, dated 8th October 1928.

Order dated 31st October 1928, Dis. 81/R/1104.

In the Diwan's Proceedings read as first paper above, the prosecution of the parties concerned in the construction of the building in Survey No. 302 of the Aranattukara Village was sanctioned. Accordingly orders were issued to the Diwan Peishkar and the Trichur Sirkar Vakil for proceeding with the prosecution. The Bishop of Trichur soon after represented that the building in question was not a place of public worship and that any legal steps taken in the matter would affect the feelings of the Christian community. Though a prosecution was ordered in the first instance, it appeared that the whole question required reconsideration in the light of fresh facts brought to the notice of the Government. The two contending parties were therefore given an opportunity to present their respective cases before the Government. Pending final settlement of the question, further proceedings connected with the prosecution were suspended.

Government have gone into the question in all its aspects. The main point arising for decision is whether the building was constructed for the purpose of being used as a place of public worship within the meaning of section 2 of Regulation I of 1062. Section 2 lays down.—

"From and after the aforesaid date (1st day of Mithunam 1062) no person shall erect, or attempt to erect any building for the purpose of public worship, or convert any existing building into a place of public worship, or utilise or enclose ground for the purpose of public burial, without obtaining the previous sanction of Our Government in writing, under the hand of